

TAC MEETING MINUTES

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology

Friday, April 2, 2010
10:00 AM - 2:30 PM

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
Administrative Office of the Courts
1501 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Conference Room 230

MEMBERS PRESENT

Steve Ballance
Ron Bitterli
Jennifer Gilbertson
Karl Heckart, Chair
Randy Kennedy
Jeremiah Matthews
Jared Nishimoto
Rick Rager
Kyle Rimel

GUESTS

Odette Apodaca*, *Pinal Superior Court*
Charles Drake*, *PCCJC*
Nick Felber*, *Yuma Superior Court*
Jack Feldhaus, *Yavapai County Justice Integration*
Christy Koehler, *Gilbert Muni Court*
Rona Newton, *Pima Juvenile*
Tom Watson*, *Pinal Superior Court*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
Cary Meister
Eloise Price
David Stevens

AOC STAFF

Richard Blair, *ITD*
Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
William Earl, *ITD*
Gary Graham, *ITD*
Keith Kaplan, *CSD*
Patrick McGrath, *CSD*
Alicia Moffatt, *ITD*
Gene Stout, *ITD*
Jeff Viemont, *ITD*

* indicates appeared via telephone

TAC MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND OPENING REMARKS

Karl Heckart

Karl Heckart, chair of the Technical Advisory Council (TAC), called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and took a roll call of those in the room and on the phone. Staff confirmed that a quorum existed. Karl provided a brief update on the chief justice's strategic agenda that was recently released. He described the Supreme Court website update that accompanied release of the new strategic agenda and the ripple effect of budget-related issues. New AOC employees Alicia Moffatt and Richard Blair were introduced.

UPDATE

KEY PROJECT UPDATES

Karl Heckart

Karl briefed members on the progress of certain state-level initiatives:

- Testing of e-filing work underway with the Maricopa Clerk's Office for civil subsequent filings and meeting with law firms in the Phoenix regarding a "soft launch" of AZTurboCourt before the State Bar Convention marketing blitz in June.
- Progress with Pima Clerk's Office on the full, statewide model, case filing efforts, starting with civil cases then likely moving to family law cases. Testing is now planned for summer.
- Appellate e-filing progress toward the August target date as well as considerations for a phased approach to implementation.
- The purchase of a product from AmCad (now called ROAM but formerly called Smart Data Layer) that will power both the central case index (CCI) and the statistics reports for AJACS. The product may eventually enable online, real-time dashboards for courts. Members discussed the various aspects of uncertainty in the data used to create reports. Report development and standardization efforts must progress in parallel.
- AZTEC enhancements necessary to enable justice courts around the state to accept e-filings.
- The construction of the central document repository (CDR) at AOC discussed at past meetings. Conversations are underway about how to load the repository initially and how to apply the publish/subscribe model to remain synchronized with standalone OnBase systems around the state.
- Progress on development of the statewide limited jurisdiction (LJ) and EDMS solution for smaller courts using disconnected scanning. Discussion focused on whether LJ courts should adopt disconnected scanning and the state system or simply be connected to the superior court EDMS and have their documents transferred to the CDR, depending on the network topology.
- Case management systems (CMS) for GJ and LJ courts. Version 3.4 of AJACS will have numerous LJ functions, including ADRS and OnBase integration. Lessons learned from the GJ rollout are being applied to the LJ conversion and rollout. AJACS/JOLTSaz integration will be included in Release 3.6. AOC is considering just how much chaos courts can endure in how short a time period before rolling out further statewide automation.
- Reconsidering the data warehouse strategy in response to the new environment for data resulting from all the changes previously mentioned. It can no longer be AZTEC-centric.

TAC MEETING MINUTES

- Governance of steering committees over enhancements to AJACS, both at the GJ and LJ level, and eventually at the Probation level, as well.
- Rolling out ADRS to local courts, especially considering efforts being taken over by AOC instead of having DPS do training under a federal grant. Pinal continues to test and train using an integrated model that seems to work well.

DISCUSS

EA TABLE REVIEW/UPDATE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

William Earl

Stewart Bruner recapped the update process of the architecture targets for courts. Redlined changes to the table were circulated following discussion about controversial areas at the previous meeting. Over the past month of review by members; Stewart has heard nothing indicating further updates were unacceptable, so the focus was on making a recommendation for acceptance of the table by COT. Members requested two further sets of changes to the table: addition of Microsoft Office 2010 programs on the watchlist and addition of SSRS to the reporting tools product baselines. Stewart agreed to make both changes. The appropriate role of ftp was rehashed and left unchanged in the table.

MOTION

A motion was made and seconded to approve the 2010 update of the enterprise architecture table, as modified in the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

The updated table will be presented for formal approval at the COT annual meeting May 6.

UPDATE

SSRS AD HOC REPORTING STRATEGY

William Earl

William Earl reviewed in detail a recently-issued e-mail sent to court leaders regarding the approach to implementing Windows SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS) for ad hoc reporting with AJACS. He made a distinction between web-based product training and the immersion bootcamp, a two-day report creation effort staffed by the AOC's technical resources using court representatives highly skilled with the Crystal product for the specific reports being constructed. Priorities for bootcamps and reports are being determined by the GJ steering committee and Pat McGrath's reporting subteam. William also highlighted changes in the access request requirements to include approval by the presiding judge and clerk of court due to security concerns. Training will be a court cost to better manage the numbers of people being trained.

REVIEW

EXECUTIVE/JUDICIAL BRANCH COORDINATION

Karl Heckart

Karl reminded members of his previous brief report from meeting with county managers and his intention to meet with County IT representatives sometime this summer. The County Supervisors' Association representative from COT has been added to the TAC extended distribution list. Members generally felt that meeting would be a good idea, especially around the topic of increasing efficiency, but described their concerns or recommendations about the following things:

TAC MEETING MINUTES

- Notes from the discussion including attendees, issues raised, and decisions to keep court IT from being blindsided, especially in areas where the local court has been putting up resistance.
- Brief local court leadership in advance or invite local court representatives to the meetings.
- Beware of non-IT county managers tagging along to inflict their specific political agendas on the AOC.
- Consider things the local courts would like to gain access to at the county level – solicit efficiency ideas from courts to share with the county.

Karl stated his intention to invite all the county IT managers to Phoenix for a single day, top-down meeting rather than meeting with them individually and dealing with local-only issues county-by-county. He plans to brief the presiding judges in advance of holding the meeting.

DISCUSS

ONBASE UPDATE

Stewart Bruner

Stewart Bruner introduced Jethro Sheridan as the new owner of both the CDR and the LJ CMS, and delineated his role as constructing and maintaining the core OnBase systems for statewide use but not for programming applications or creating integration between OnBase and other systems. Stewart also provided a brief progress update on the proposal evaluation effort for the new OnBase services contract. There were two bidders: OSAM and AmCad.

In support of a federated model in the document management area, certain standards need to be decided. Historically, courts purchased, installed, configured, determined keywords for, programmed enhancements to, etc., their local OnBase systems independent of any other systems. e-Filing and public access now require tying together the systems that were created independently. Metadata items transmitted from local systems need to be respected by the AOC system, i.e., a sealed document designation. Stewart asked members whether OnBase keywords were necessary and if so how many needed to be standardized.

Discussion focused on whether there was value in replicating keywords in OnBase when the CCI was capturing data from the CMS records. Focus then turned to determining the minimum set of keywords that would have to accompany documents being transported between systems, since consensus was that case number alone is not sufficient. Disaster recovery considerations also came into play.

The chair directed staff to call together a subteam representing all the case management systems in the state and including various OnBase administrators to make a recommendation to TAC concerning keywords and allowed values before the CDR becomes active as well as what language is therefore appropriate for e-filing-related technical standards.

DISCUSS

TARGETED LOCAL COURT TOPICS

Various

Kyle Rimel's issue regarding marking documents to prevent public access was handed over to the team formed in the previous agenda item. Jared Nishimoto shared an idea to electronically link together court technology resources throughout the state to facilitate asking questions and sharing information. Kyle also requested that a master inventory of local applications be made available from analysis of the county IT plans. Karl directed William Earl to create a private Google group and see what the usage turns out to be on a pilot basis before deciding whether to

TAC MEETING MINUTES

expand and publicize the group. Jared suggested that rules of use be published on the opening page to ensure those not on TAC have the same understanding. Suggested rules include that moderators have to approve membership, participants must use their real names, and members must be Arizona court technical resources only.

Randy Kennedy asked the group about their experiences with live chat on the web (usually linked from a public website) akin to that being done by the federal bankruptcy court. Karl's concern was that it creates an expectation on the customer's part. Those familiar with the software package stated that the icon can be removed when no representative is available and the cost per session is minimal. Other issues raised involved the public records footprint made by the solution and whether GoogleWAVE would do the same thing.

DISCUSS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT AND PLAN FOR COT

Karl Heckart

Karl outlined the parameters for the subcommittee updates in the streamlined, single-day format of the COT annual meeting this year. He requested that members share items of importance for COT besides the EA table update:

- 2011 Plan – Rules updates/rewrites (124, 1-504, 1-506, 1-507).
- 2011 Plan – Subteam to standardize minimum OnBase keywords and values.
- TAC Issue – Executive Branch coordination meetings.
- TAC Issue – TRACS eCitation repository, requirement to store an image of every ticket, and potential need for courts to access multiple repositories for tickets.
- TAC Issue – Timeline for mandating eCitation use by law enforcement to eliminate paper tickets.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Karl Heckart

After hearing no further discussion from members or the public, Karl adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Upcoming Meetings:

August 6, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 230
October 8, 2010	AOC – Conference Room 230

MEETING ADJOURNED

1:40 PM